

Conrad
C5

a first reflective finish disposed on the interior reflecting surface;
a reflector portion coupled to the interior reflecting surface;
an elongated tubular light source mounted in the semi-circular reflector portion, the semicircular reflector portion formed around the elongated tubular light source;
a second reflective finish disposed on the semi-circular reflector portions; and
a lens portion coupled to the housing portion;
such that the reflective finish reflects light from said elongated tubular light source towards the lens portion.

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed April 30, 2002, the Examiner (i) rejected claims 1-8, 10, 14, 15 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lieszkovszky, U.S. Patent No. 6,168,293 (Lieszkovszky '293), (ii) rejected claims 1-8, 10, 14, 15, and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by King et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,199,787 (King '787), (iii) rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lieszkovszky '293 in view of Daumueller et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,975,723 (Daumueller '723), and (iv) rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over King '787 in view of Daumueller '723.

The Examiner further stated that the Declaration pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.131, filed on February 8, 2002, has been considered but is ineffective to overcome Lieszkovszky '293.

I. EXAMINER INTERVIEW

Applicants gratefully thank Examiner Choi and Primary Examiner Sember for the telephonic interview conducted on July 29, 2002. As set forth, the specification has been amended as suggested by the Examiners to include a supplemental figure (i.e., Figure 5) illustrating an alternate view of Figure 4. The specification has also been revised to include a description of the supplemental figure. No new matter has been added. Additionally, claims 1,

7, and 14 have been amended solely for the purpose of clarifying the claims, as suggested by and discussed with the Examiner. No new matter has been added.

As stated by the Interview Summary mailed August 9, 2002, “[a]pplicant’s declaration pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.131 was sufficient (sic) evidence to show reduction of practice to overcome filing date of USPN 6,168,293. Reference to King et al. USPN 5,199,787 was also discussed and applicant and examiner agreed that the light source of the invention is a neon tube, not a common filament bulb as shown by King et al. reference.”

As requested by the Examiner, for clarification purposes, Applicants submit the following supplemental description of page 8 of the Declaration pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.131, filed on February 8, 2002 (i.e., Graph of Reflector and FMVSS Requirements for a CHMSL). As shown in the graph, the line drawn with triangles outlines the light output versus angle of reflector facets for the Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards 571.108 (FMVSS). The line drawn with squares outlines the light output produced by one arrangement of the reflector of the present invention. A facet location and angle are chosen such that the configured multi-faceted reflector creates a light distribution pattern that complies with certain light distribution requirements, such as requirements of FMVSS. (Specification, page 10, lines 16-20).

II. CLAIM REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and §103(a)

Since the Declaration pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.131, filed on February 8, 2002, is sufficient to overcome Lieszkovszky ‘293, Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 1-8, 10, 14, 15 and 17-20 as being anticipated by Lieszkovszky ‘293 should be withdrawn. In addition, Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 11 as being unpatentable over Lieszkovszky ‘293 as applied to claim 7 above and further in view of Daumueller ‘723 should also be withdrawn for at least the same reason.

III. CLAIM REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and §103(a)

Furthermore, as indicated by the Examiner, independent claims 1, 7, and 14, as amended for clarity purposes, now stand allowable over all references currently cited in the record of the present application, and more particularly, over King '787. For example, King '787 does not disclose an elongated tubular light source as within presently pending claims 1, 7, and 14. In contrast, King '787 discloses a light source 30 shown as a conventional tungsten-halogen light capsule electrically connected to a conventional medium screw base 5 by rigid current conductors or filaments 6, 7. (King '787, Col. 3, lines 7-13).

Therefore, the rejection of claims 1-8, 10, 14, 15, and 17-20 as being anticipated by King '787 and the rejection of claim 11 as being unpatentable over King '787 as applied to claim 7 and further in view of Daumueller '723 should both be withdrawn.

IV. SUMMARY

In conclusion, it is submitted that Applicants have overcome each of the Examiner's rejections. It is submitted, therefore, that the present patent application, including pending claims 1-8, 10-11, 14-15, and 17-20, is in condition for allowance and early notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

If for any reason, the application is not considered to be in condition for allowance on the next Office Action and an interview would be helpful to resolve any remaining issues, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (312) 913-0001.

Respectfully submitted,

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff

Dated: 8/30/02

By: 

Thomas E. Wettermann
Reg. No. 41,523